

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

PROVIDENCE, SC.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
BOARD OF MEDICAL LICENSURE  
and DISCIPLINE

No. C-88/033

VS.

ANGUS JEFFERSON DODDS, M.D.

ORDER

pursuant to Administrative Hearing Notice dated April 13, 1990, by the Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline, Angus Jefferson Dodds, M.D. [hereinafter referred to as "Respondent"], was summoned to appear before said Board to answer charges arising out of Respondent's violation of a Consent Order entered into between Respondent and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Department of Health Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline on or about February 15, 1989 as well as other allegations as follows:

1. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (19) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of incompetent, negligent, or willful misconduct in the practice of medicine by reason of his diversion of Hycodan on or about December 13, 1989.
2. That Respondent violated Sections 5-37-5.1 (19) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of incompetent, negligent or willful misconduct in the practice of medicine by reason of his diversion of Erythromycin on or about December 13, 1989.
3. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (19) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of incompetent, negligent, or willful misconduct in the practice of medicine by reason of his diversion of Amoxicillin on or about December 13, 1989.
4. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent

"Order" entered on February 15, 1989. This violation included, but was not limited to, his diversion and/or his possession of Hycodan on or about December 13, 1989.

5. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989. This violation included, but was not limited to, dispensing PV Tussin to a family member on diverse dates commencing on or about November 8, 1989 to on or about December 12, 1989.
6. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989. This violation included, but was not limited to, possessing PV Tussin on diverse dates commencing on or about November 8, 1989 to on or about December 12, 1989.
7. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of a violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989. This violation included, but was not limited to, dispensing Hydrocodone to a family member on or about December 12, 1989.
8. That Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that Respondent was guilty of violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989. This violation included, but was not limited to, possession Hydrocodone on or about December 12, 1989.

The three members of the hearing committee were as follows:

Edmund Hackman, M.D., Chairman

Edwin Foreman, M.D.

Conrad Ferla

Alan P. Gelfuso, Esquire acted as legal counsel to the Hearing Committee on May 7, 1990. Joseph M. Raneaka, Esquire, acted as legal counsel to the Hearing Committee for all subsequent hearings held in this matter.

Frederic A. Charleton, Esquire acted as legal counsel to the State.

Robert Smith, Esquire acted as legal counsel to the Respondent.

The following agreements and stipulations between counsel for the State and counsel for Respondent were made and accepted by the Hearing Committee prior to the commencement of the proceedings:

- (a) Respondent admitted that he ordered Hycodan on December 13, 1989 as set forth in paragraph 1 of the Administrative Hearing Notice. Respondent denied the allegation that he diverted Hycodan.
- (b) Respondent admitted that he ordered Erythromycin on December 13, 1989 as set forth in paragraph 1 of the Administrative Hearing Notice. Respondent denied the allegation that he diverted Erythromycin.
- (c) Paragraph 3 of the Administrative Hearing Notice alleges that Respondent diverted Amoxicillin on or about December 13, 1989. The parties agreed that this allegation may be dismissed. The Hearing Committee dismissed this allegation. After disposition of various motions and introduction of Exhibits, the State presented its first witness, Pharmacist A, who testified on direct examination as follows. Pharmacist A testified that he was employed at a certain pharmacy and he had been at that particular location for six and a half years. He testified that he was authorized to fill prescriptions of all kinds of drugs and that there were two full time pharmacists

employed at that particular location.

Pharmacist A testified that a prescription for Hydrocodone and Erythromycin were telephoned in by someone purporting to be Respondent for an individual hereinafter referred to as Mr. X. Pharmacist A testified that he did recognize Respondent by name but he couldn't say that he recognized his voice. Pharmacist A further testified that he had occasion to fill the prescription for Hydrocodone and Erythromycin for Mr. X on December 13, 1989.

Pharmacist A testified that when he filled the prescriptions he placed them in a bag and stapled the receipt for the prescriptions to that bag and placed it in the bin near the cash register. Pharmacist A stated that it was his practice to always be near the cash register so that he can "eyeball" and always have his ear open as to what is going on to assure that prescriptions are being dispensed to the correct person. He testified that his station is approximately sixteen feet from the pick up area for drugs and that the pick up area is within clear view of his station. Pharmacist A testified that a gentleman came in and asked the technician "can I have a prescription for Mr. X". He testified that he saw the person who picked up the prescription, who was approximately sixteen feet from Pharmacist A.

Pharmacist A testified that he got a good view of the person who picked up the prescription and that there were no obstructions from the person mid chest and up. Pharmacist A had reason to believe that the person picking up the prescriptions was not Mr. X because he knew an individual with a similar name early in life as a student in school. The address on the prescription was in the same area of Town where he was a student with Mr. X.

Pharmacist A testified that he recognized the person who picked up the prescriptions as the Respondent. Pharmacist A testified that he knew the Respondent from the summer of 1988, and that he had an accident and needed stitches in his finger. Respondent administered medical treatment to Pharmacist A at a

local emergency room. Pharmacist A testified that there was no doubt in his mind that the person picking up the prescription was the Respondent and he identified the Respondent at the hearing on May 7, 1990 as the same person who picked up the prescription on December 13, 1989.

Pharmacist A testified that on that same day, he had telephoned Mr. X and spoke with Mr. X's father, who is known by the same first name as Mr. X. and will hereinafter be referred to as Mr. Y. Pharmacist A testified that he spoke with Mr. Y and he asked him if he had a prescription filled for him or if someone picked up a prescription in his drug store for him. Mr. Y's response was that "no, no one would". He asked Mr. Y if he had a prescription ordered from his drug store. Mr. Y told him no.

On cross-examination by Mr. Smith, Pharmacist A testified that it is not a normal occurrence when the doctor who called the drug in actually picks it up. Mr. Smith then asked Pharmacist A why he did not question the Respondent when he picked up the drugs for the patient. Pharmacist A testified that he didn't feel that he had to, because he had no way of knowing whether the Respondent was picking it up for a friend because he did not know Mr. X at that point. Mr. Smith then asked if the pharmacist called the medical center where the Respondent worked, Pharmacist A responded no.

Mr. Charleton, on redirect examination, asked Pharmacist A if there was any doubt in his mind that the gentleman who appeared on that date was in fact the Respondent. Pharmacist A identified the Respondent from a group of pictures that was shown to Pharmacist A by an inspector from the Division of Drug Control.

On re-cross examination, Mr. Smith questioned the pharmacist as to why he called Mr. Y to make sure that he wasn't the one who came in. Pharmacist A stated that he called not to find out if he came in, but to find out if the prescription would have been called in for the family of Mr. Y.

The pharmacist was then examined by the Chairman of the Hearing Committee as to the composition of Vicodin. The witness responded that Vicodin is a brand name for a combination of two drugs Hydrocodone and acetaminophen, better known as Tylenol.

Vicodin is the brand name and Hydrocodone was the chemical or generic name of a narcotic component of that drug.

A second witness called by Mr. Charleson was Mr. Y. He testified that he had been treated by the place of employment of the Respondent years ago, but he did not have occasion to appear at that facility on December 13, 1989. He did not call the facility for any medical advise at any time during this time frame. Mr. Y further testified that he did not know the Respondent from this facility and he did not recognize the Respondent at the hearing. This witness testified that he did receive a telephone call from Pharmacist A on or about December 13, 1989 and that he told Pharmacist A that neither he nor any other member of his family placed a prescription with the Respondent.

The cross-examination of this witness by Mr Smith related to how this witness recalled a telephone conversation five months earlier. Mr. Y stated that the telephone call seemed unusual to him.

The third witness to be called was the son of Mr. Y., Mr. X. This witness testified that he had been treated by the Respondent in October of 1989 and that he saw him for exactly ten minutes. On this visit, the Respondent prescribed some medication for Mr. X. This prescription was not filled at Pharmacist A's pharmacy. Mr. X testified that he never went back or saw Respondent after October of 1989.

On cross-examination by Mr. Smith, Mr. X testified that he did talk with the Respondent once after his treatment on the telephone regarding tests that the Respondent had previously taken. Mr. X testified that this was the last time that this patient had spoken with the Respondent.

testified that he was a registered pharmacist and owner of a prescription and surgical center in the area where the Respondent was practicing. He was asked if he brought certain records with him, pursuant to a subpoena in regards to the prescriptions ordered by the Respondent and he answered in the affirmative. Pharmacist B brought a prescription for an individual related to the Respondent, hereinafter referred to as Relative One, dated December 6, 1989 for P/V Tussin. Pharmacist B testified that this was a telephone order received from the Respondent, and he received this order himself. He testified that he did know the Respondent's voice, and that in his opinion, the individual who made the call was the Respondent.

Upon further questioning by Mr. Charleson, Pharmacist B testified that a prescription was called in subsequent to December 6, 1989 by the Respondent for Relative One on December 10, 1989 for P/V Tussin and for Vistaril. According to the testimony, both of these prescriptions were filled and dispensed.

Mr. Charleson then questioned Pharmacist B about a prescription from the Respondent issued for a second individual related to Respondent, hereinafter referred to as Relative Two, on December 12, 1989 for P/V Tussin. Again this was a prescription called in by the Respondent and later filled and dispensed by Pharmacist B.

Mr. Charleson then inquired about two prescriptions also being issued on December 12, 1989 on behalf of a third individual related to the Respondent, hereinafter referred to as Relative Three. One prescription was for Vicodin. The other prescription was for Soma for Relative Three. Pharmacist B testified that Vicodin was a trade name for Hydrocodone and acetaminophen, and that the medication was dispensed as a generic version of Vicodin. Pharmacist B testified that the call was not taken by him, and that there were two prescriptions listed, the bottom one being the Hydrocodone. Pharmacist B testified that he was present when the first prescription for

p/v Tussin to Relative One was picked up on December 6, 1989, but he cannot say with certainty that he was present when the other prescription was picked up. Pharmacist B testified that the Respondent asked for the prescription on December 6, 1989, at the counter, which was six feet from him and he was able to observe the Respondent at this time. He was asked if he knew the Doctor before that time, and he testified yes he did, and when he called the Respondent by name, the Respondent responded to him.

On cross examination by Mr. Smith, Pharmacist B testified that he became concerned on December 12, 1989 when his assistant manager questioned a previous phone order by Respondent for Relative Three at which point there began an in-depth review of his prescribing patterns retroactive to October 1, 1989. This review revealed a number of prescriptions for Hydrocodone containing prescriptions written for family members. Mr. Smith asked Pharmacist B if the Respondent did prescribe Hydrocodone. Pharmacist B responded that Respondent did, by virtue of a telephone order for PV Tussin, which contains Hydrocodone.

The next witness to be called by the State was a former Employer of the Respondent, hereinafter referred to as Physician A.

Physician A testified that on December 13, 1989, he received a telephone call from the Respondent, who was employed by Physician A at that time, the Respondent stated to Physician A that he prescribed Vicodin for Mr. X and in the event the pharmacy should check up on it the Respondent wanted Physician A to know he had prescribed the medication. Physician A noted the prescription on Mr. X's medical record. The notation on the chart of Mr. X was entered as States full exhibit number 14.

On cross examination by Mr. Smith, Physician A testified that the Respondent had been employed by his facility for approximately one year and that he felt the Respondent's practice of medicine was very good. Physician A also testified that he had written letters to the Board which stated

Respondent continued to perform his duties in a professional manner and showed no evidence of substance abuse.

On redirect examination by Mr. Charleson Physician A testified that if he had seen the prescriptions written by the Respondent for Relative One, Relative Two and Relative Three, that would have raised suspicions.

The State's next witness was the Respondent. The Respondent testified on direct examination by Mr. Charleson that he prescribed medication to a family member which contained Hydrocodone. He testified he prescribed Vicodin for Relative Three and picked up that prescription himself at the drug store. The Respondent further testified that he prescribed and picked up P.V. Tussin for Relative Two on December 12, 1989 and that he also prescribed and picked up P.V. Tussin for Relative One on December 6th and/or December 10, 1989. He testified that he prescribed P.V. Tussin for Relative One and Relative Two because they had bad upper respiratory infections. Respondent testified that he ordered Hydrocodone or Vicodin for Relative Three because she had some trouble with her neck and back and also a headache.

Respondent further testified that he received a telephone call from someone alleging to be Mr. X who complained of upper respiratory complaints. Respondent testified he called in a prescription from his home to the pharmacy for Mr. X the day following this telephone call from Mr. X and notified Physician A that he had called in prescription for Mr. X on the same day. Respondent testified he was not the person who picked up the prescription ordered for Mr. X from the pharmacy owned by Pharmacist A.

Upon completion of the direct examination of the Respondent by Mr. Charleson and cross examination by Mr. Smith, Mr. Charleson indicated the State would rest at that time.

The first witness called upon to testify on behalf of the Respondent was a former employer, hereinafter referred to as Physician B. Physician B testified he had known the Respondent

since 1985 when they were members of the same staff at Pawtucket Memorial Hospital where they worked together for about a year and a half. He also testified that the Respondent had worked with Physician B at his present facility in 1989 and in fact that facility had offered the Respondent a full time position for January 1, 1990, but was later told by Respondent that he would have to withdraw from the medical facility because he was advised by the Disciplinary Board that he should not work.

Physician B testified that his personal observations were that during his involvement with Respondent on shift changes, that Respondent was not acting irregularly or acting intoxicated and that Physician B and his associate were pleased with the Respondent's job performance.

The second witness called by Mr. Smith in Respondent's defense was a counselor hereinafter called Mr. Z. Mr. Z testified he was presently a certified alcoholism counselor in the State of Rhode Island. Mr. Z was a former narcotics agent in the Division of Drug Control for the State of Rhode Island Department of Health and was also a former policeman in the City of Newport. Mr. Z testified he has counseled the Respondent since February 1989 to assist the Respondent in recovery from alcoholism and a substance abuse problem.

Mr. Z testified that Codeine based cough syrups such as PV Tussin, and Hycodan, are abused substances but those substances have a minimal street value for sale to substance abusers. He also testified that during his experience as a counselor he has never treated an individual who has been addicted to that type of substance.

The third witness to testify on behalf of the Respondent was Physician C who is a member of the Impaired Physicians Committee. Physician C gave testimony about the purpose and procedures of the impaired physician Committee. Part of the program is for the impaired physicians to sign a contract which includes that the physician be required to participate in individual and group therapy as well as to submit to routine

urine testing. The urine is tested for a wide spectrum of drugs.

Physician C testified that the Respondent does have a contract with the Impaired Physician Committee of the Rhode Island Medical Society which he signed April 28, 1988.

Physician B testified that since the time Respondent has submitted to urine screenings he tested positive twice, August and October of 1988. Since that time according to the testimony he had ninety six urine screenings where he has had no positive tests. The testimony also indicated Respondent has been tested twice a week since the signing of the contract. It was also determined through this witness that due to the required frequency of testing the actual number of tests that should have been performed since October, 1988 should have been in excess of one hundred and sixty tests. The records of urine tests of the Respondent were subsequently admitted as Exhibit Two for the Respondent.

Respondent was then called upon to testify in his own behalf. The Respondent testified that he did have a contract with the Impaired Physicians Committee and explained what he was required to do in accordance with that contract. He testified as to how the procedure was set up for his scheduled urine testings and also gave his explanation as to why a certain number of screenings were never performed. The Respondent testified about the various counseling programs he attended for his chemical abuse problem. Respondent also testified where he practiced medicine in the year 1989, his duties at the facility, and how many patients he saw per day. Respondent testified that he did prescribe controlled substances for Relative Number One, Relative Number Two and Relative Number Three in December of 1989. He further testified that it did not occur to him that he was violating the intent of the Consent Order. He also described the circumstances surrounding his order of a prescription medication for Mr. X. It was the Respondent's testimony, that Mr. X or someone who identified himself as Mr.

X, called Respondent with chronic or upper respiratory complaints, asked for cough medicine and he (Respondent) agreed to call in a prescription for cough medicine and an antibiotic. He testified that he forgot to do so when he spoke with Mr. X on the phone and had called the prescription in the next day. He further testified that he was not in Pharmacist A's pharmacy on December 13, 1989, or prior to that date. The Respondent testified that based on the advice of the Medical Board he has not worked as a Doctor since December 22, 1989.

On cross examination by Mr. Charleton, Respondent testified that he signed a Consent Order with the Department of Health, Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline on January 21, 1989, [hereinafter called the Order]. He admitted at the time of the signing of the Order that he had a substance abuse problem and he had problems in Medical School with alcohol abuse. He further testified that he did not have any trouble when he was affiliated with South County Hospital Emergency Room.

Respondent testified that he developed an addiction to the drug Vicodin when he was affiliated with Pawtucket Memorial Hospital. He also testified it was his decision to leave his employment with Pawtucket Memorial Hospital. On cross-examination by Mr. Charleton, Respondent explained why some urine tests were missed. His explanation was that on rare occasions the call from the Impaired Physicians Committee asking him to come in for a test was not relayed to him. He also testified that on another occasion the laboratory he had been using did not have the correct zip code for the State Medical Society, and as a result they did not receive all of the reports that they should have received. Respondent also stated on cross-examination that subsequent to his actions he realized that dispensing controlled substances to family members was

technically violating the terms of the Order. Respondent also testified on cross-examination his explanation of the circumstances surrounding his prescription of Hycodan for Mr. X. That is, he stated he received a telephone call from an

individual purporting to be Mr. X who complained of upper respiratory problems.

The next witness called by the defense to testify was Relative Number Three. On direct examination Relative Number Three testified regarding her knowledge of Respondent's problem with substance abuse and the events which led the Respondent to sign the Order. Relative Number Three also testified that she did receive the prescription for Vicodin from the Respondent in December 1989. She further stated that she took one or two pills of the Vicodin for back pain and a headache and threw the rest down the toilet. She also testified she was surprised that the Respondent had brought the Vicodin to her. Relative Number Three testified further that she did observe Relative Number One and Relative Number Two take the medication prescribed and given to them by the Respondent.

The final witness to be called for the Respondent was a board certified psychiatrist, hereinafter referred to as Physician D. Physician D testified that he has worked with the Impaired Physicians Committee of the Rhode Island Medical Society for about four and one-half years counseling physicians, dentists, chiropractors or podiatrists. He testified that he first started treating the Respondent in May of 1988. He further testified that he diagnosed the Respondent as suffering from chronic alcoholism and chronic multiple substance abuse. Prior to Respondent's treatment, he was addicted to the use of Soma and Vicodin. He is currently treating the Respondent once a week for a 90 minute session. Physician D also testified that Respondent has attended group sessions on a regular basis and has given him no apparent concern that he was abusing either alcohol or other substance abuse. Physician D also testified that in his opinion, if the Respondent were to start with drugs he tends to use them in increasing doses to the point where they are out of control.

On cross-examination Physician D, testified that the chances of the Respondent taking a narcotic drug during December

of 1989 were not great, but a possibility did exist. Upon further questioning by Dr. Foreman of the Hearing Committee, Physician D testified that to the best of his knowledge, a reasonable degree of medical certainty is 80% regarding his opinion that the Respondent did not take a narcotic drug during December of 1989.

After disposition of a ruling on the introduction of certain Exhibits by Mr. Charleson, both the State and the Respondent rested.

The Respondent admits that on December 13, 1989 he ordered the drugs Hycodan and Erythromycin set forth in Count I, Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Administrative Hearing Notice. It is uncontested that these drugs ordered on December 13, 1989 were not picked up by the individual under whose name they were ordered, Mr. X, by the Respondent. The Board believes Pharmacist A who testified that the person who asked for and picked up the prescriptions ordered for Mr. X. on December 13, 1989, was the Respondent in this case, Angus Jefferson Dodds.

The Board does not believe the Respondent's testimony that he was not the individual who picked up the prescription for Mr. X.

It is also uncontested that the Respondent did dispense PV Tussin to members of his family on diverse dates, including December 6, 1989, December 10, 1989 and December 12, 1989. Further it was shown by a fair preponderance of the evidence that the Respondent dispensed the drug Hydrocodone to a family member on December 12, 1989.

Respondent was in violation of the Consent Order entered on February 15, 1989 by possessing the drugs PV Tussin and Hydrocodone, since the Respondent by his own admission, as well as the testimony of Relative Number Three, did deliver the prescriptions to various family members.

The Board believed the various witnesses presented on Respondent's behalf who testified that the Respondent is making a sincere effort to control his drug abuse problem. As to the

testimony offered by Mr. Z, while not disbelieved, the Board finds that his testimony offered no real probative evidence that would assist them in making a determination on the charges.

Upon consideration and evaluation of the competent, probative testimony presented to it, the Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline makes the following findings of fact:

1. The Respondent ordered the drugs Hycodan and Erythromycin on or about December 13, 1989 under the name of a former patient, Mr. X, from pharmacist A.

2. Mr. X did not call the Respondent on or about December 12, 1989 to complain of upper respiratory problems.

3. Mr. X was not the individual who picked up the prescriptions ordered by Respondent from Pharmacist A.

4. The Respondent was the person who picked up the drugs Hycodan and Erythromycin, ordered in the name of Mr. X from Pharmacist A.

5. Respondent did divert and/or possess the drugs Hycodan and Erythromycin on December 13, 1989.

6. Respondent did prescribe the drug PV Tussin to a family member or members on December 6, 1989, December 10, 1989 and December 12, 1989.

7. The Respondent did possess the drug PV Tussin on December 6, 1989, December 10, 1989 and December 12, 1989.

8. The Respondent did dispense the drug Hydrocodone in the form of Vicodin, for a family member on or about December 12, 1989.

9. The Respondent did possess the drug Hydrocodone in the form of Vicodin on or about December 12, 1989.

#### DECISION

- 1). As to the charge that Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (19) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956 as Amended, by reason of his diversion of Hycodan on or about December 13, 1989, the Board finds the Respondent, guilty.

2. As to the charge that the Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (19) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, by reason of his diversion of Erythromycin on or about December 13, 1989, the Board finds the Respondent, guilty.

3. As to the charge that the Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that he violated a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989 by reason of his diversion and/or possession of Hycodan on or about December 13, 1989, the Board finds the Respondent, guilty.

4. As to the charge that the Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that he violated a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989 by reason of dispensing PV Tussin to a family member, the Board finds Respondent, guilty.

5. As to the charge that Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, by reason of his violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989, by reason of his possession of PV Tussin the Board finds the Respondent, guilty.

6. As to the charge that the Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, by reason of violation of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989, by reason of dispensing Hydrocodone to a family member, the Board finds the Respondent guilty.

7. As to the charge that the Respondent violated Section 5-37-5.1 (24) of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, 1956, as Amended, in that he was guilty of violation of a stipulation or agreement of the Board by reason of a "Consent Order" entered on February 15, 1989 by reason of his possession of Hydrocodone the Board finds the Respondent, guilty.

ORDER

1. That Angus Jefferson Dodds, M.D. be reprimanded and censured for unprofessional conduct with regard to his violation of the terms of a "Consent Order" with the Board signed and agreed to by him and entered as an Order of the Board on or about February 15, 1989.
2. That Angus Jefferson Dodds, M.D. be reprimanded and censured for unprofessional conduct by reason of his diversion of Hycodan and Erythromycin on or about December 13, 1989.
3. That the license to practice medicine within the State of Rhode Island issued to Angus Jefferson Dodds is hereby suspended forthwith.
4. That upon the expiration of no less than eighteen (18) months from the time the Respondent voluntarily ceased the practice of medicine on December 22, 1989, Respondent may petition the Board for reinstatement of his license to practice medicine provided, the reinstatement of said license shall take place under such conditions the full Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline of the State of Rhode Island shall then deem fit and appropriate.
5. That in accordance with the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, there is hereby assessed against the Respondent administrative costs of these proceedings in the amount of Four thousand (\$4,000.00) Dollars to be paid forthwith.

ENTERED as an Order of the Board of Medical Licensure and Discipline for the State of Rhode Island this 26th day of July 1990.

*Edmund T. Hackman, M.D.*  
Edmund T. Hackman, M.D.  
Chairman

*Conrad Ferla*  
Conrad Ferla

*Edwin N. Forman*  
Edwin N. Forman, M.D.